REMARKS

1.   Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed August 20, 2008, claims 1-5 and 8-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,068,599 (Jiang). Furthermore, claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jiang in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,213,076 (Bodin). Additionally, the Office Action raised objections to the specification for containing embedded hyperlinks.

2.   Status of the Claims

Claims 1-11 and 13-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 17 are independent, and the remainder are dependent. Claim 12 has been withdrawn.

3.   Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended the specification to remove embedded hyperlinks beginning with "http://" or encapsulated in "<>" symbols. Please note MPEP 608.01(VII) which states:

> Where the hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable codes themselves rather than the contents of the site to which the hyperlinks are directed are part of applicant's invention and it is necessary to have them included in the patent application in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and applicant does not intend to have these hyperlinks be active links, examiners should not object to these hyperlinks.

> Applicants' invention is directed to methods of improving the performance of web

browsing. Accordingly, examples of these methods are illustrated using partial hyperlinks in Applicants' specification in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants do not intend these hyperlinks to be active links. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner not object to these hyperlinks.

10

4.   **Response to 102(e) Rejections**

As stated above, claims 1-5 and 8-21 stand rejected as anticipated by Jiang. However, Jiang does not teach each and every element recited in any of independent claims 1, 11, and 17.

Generally speaking, Jiang is directed to a wireless network architecture in which a mobile device accesses data services via a proxy server. *Jiang, col. 1, lines 42-49.* The proxy server performs content reduction (e.g., image resolution reduction) based on the extent of wireless bandwidth that is available to the mobile device and the capabilities of the mobile device. *Jiang, col. 1, lines 42-49, col. 3, lines 10-20, col. 3, lines 30-32.*

a.   **Claim 1**

As currently amended, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the element of determining an efficiency with which the client device can process the information content when the information content is stored in the first data format versus when the information content is stored in a second data format. This claim further recites that the first data format does not involve the server applying cascading style sheet pre-processing to the information content, and the second data format involves the server applying cascading style sheet pre-processing to the information content.

Jiang does not disclose this element of claim 1. In particular, Jiang fails to disclose a first data format that does not involve the server applying cascading style sheet pre-processing to the information content, and a second data format that involves the server applying cascading style sheet pre-processing to the information content.

Since Jiang does not teach each and every element of independent claim 1, Applicants submit that this claim is allowable over the cited art. Furthermore, without conceding any assertion in the Office Action regarding dependent claims 2-10, Applicants submit that

dependent claims 2-10 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

b.   Claim 11

Independent claim 11 recites, *inter alia*, the elements of (a) determining a pre-set transformation mode associated with the wireless communication link to send the information content to the client device, wherein the pre-set transformation mode includes a proxy server mode and a proxyless mode, and wherein the pre-set transformation mode is based on user settings, and (b) based on the transmission capabilities and the pre-set mode, determining whether to send the information content to the client device using the proxy server mode or the proxyless mode. The Office Action asserts that Jiang, at col. 3, lines 46-47 and at col. 4, lines 62-65, teaches these elements. Applicants submit that this assertion is incorrect.

Jiang does not teach a pre-set transformation mode including a proxy server mode and a proxyless mode, wherein the pre-set transformation mode is based on user settings. Instead, Jiang teaches a proxy server determining, based on network conditions, whether to compress images being sent to a mobile terminal. *See, e.g., Jiang col. 3, lines 35-40.*

Furthermore, the Advisory Action mailed November 6, 2008 asserts that Jiang teaches QoS associated with operation in such a mode is "perceived by users." The Advisory Action goes on to assert that user perception of QoS implies that "the user has some control over the settings." Applicants respectfully disagree.

First, Jiang fails to disclose settings under control of a user that impacts a perceived QoS of Jiang's transformed images. Instead, Jiang discloses performing image resolution reduction based on the extent of wireless bandwidth that is available to the mobile device and the capabilities of the mobile device. *Jiang, col. 1, lines 42-49, col. 3, lines 10-20, col. 3, lines 30-*

35. Jiang does not appear to specify that these operations are based on user settings. Second, just because a user may perceive a given QoS does not imply that the user has any control over the QoS. The QoS settings (if any) could be under control of the network and not under control of the user.

Thus, Applicants submit that Jiang does not teach each and every element of independent claim 11, and therefore this claim is allowable over Jiang. Furthermore, without conceding any assertion in the Office Action regarding dependent claims 13-16, Applicants submit that dependent claims 13-16 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

c.   Claim 17

Independent claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, the elements of (a) determining an efficiency with which the client device can process information content when the information content is stored in a first data format and when the information content is stored in a second data format, (b) determining an efficiency with which the server can process the information content when the information content is stored in the first data format and when the information content is stored in the second data format, and (c) based on (i) the efficiency with which the client device can process the information content when stored in the first data format and the second data format, (ii) the efficiency with which the server can process the information content when stored in the first data format and the second data format, and (iii) the transmission capabilities of the wireless communication link used to send the information content from the server to the client device, determining whether to send the information content from the server to the client device in the first data format or the second data format. The Office Action asserts that Jiang, at col. 3, lines 21-52, teaches these elements. Applicants submit that this assertion is incorrect.

Jiang at col. 3, lines 21-52 discloses reducing image quality in a proxy server based on network conditions and device capabilites. However, Jiang does not teach determining *client and server processing efficiencies* with respect to a first data format and a second data format. Furthermore, Jiang does not disclose making a determination whether to send data in a first data format or a second data format based on these processing efficiencies. In particular, Jiang does not discuss the notion of processing efficiencies at client and server devices.

The Advisory Action mailed November 6, 2008 asserts that "determining whether or not to compress is based upon efficiency." However, Jiang determines whether to compress images based on available network link capacity. Jiang does not disclose determining whether to compress information based on the efficiencies related to network link capabilities *and* client device capabilities *and* server capabilities.

Thus, Applicants submit that Jiang does not teach each and every element of independent claim 17 and that this claim is allowable over Jiang. Furthermore, without conceding any assertion in the Office Action regarding dependent claims 18-21, Applicants submit that dependent claims 18-21 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

5.   Response to 103(a) Rejections

As discussed above, claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Jiang in view of Bodin. Bodin was cited for disclosing an 802.11(b) wireless network. However, Bodin fails to make up for the shortcomings of Jiang as set forth above. Thus, the combination of Jiang and Bodin does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 1. Consequently, at leas for these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Jiang and Bodin, and dependent claims 6 and 7 are also allowable.

14

6. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner wish to discuss this case with the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-3361.

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert and Berghoff LLP
Respectfully Submitted,

Date: <u>November 20, 2008</u>   By: <u>/Michael S. Borella/</u>
                                   Michael S. Borella

                                   Reg. No. 62,361